

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 20, 23-26, 27-32, 34 and 38-41 are amended. Support for amendments to claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 20, 23-26, 27-32, 34 and 38-41 can be found at least at claims 53 and 54, and in the instant specification at paragraphs [0352], [0353], and [0357]. Additional amendments to claims 28-32 and 34 simply delete the word "automatically" from claims 28-32 and 34. Thus, no new matter is added.

I. Amendments to the Drawings

The Office Action did not accept amended Fig. 31 attached to the November 6, 2006 Amendment. The Office Action requests that a marked-up copy of previously filed Replacement Sheet (Fig. 31) must be submitted. An Annotated Marked-up Drawings for Fig. 31 is included in this Amendment, as requested. For the Examiner's convenience, amended (Replacement Sheet) Fig. 31 filed with the November 8, 2006 Amendment is also attached. Acceptance of the drawings is thus respectfully requested.

II. §112 Rejections of Claims 27-37, and 46-62

The Office Action rejects claims 27-37 and 46-62 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, claims 27-32 and 34 are amended to cancel "automatically," and thus the rejection is obviated. Thus, claims 27-32 and 34, and claims 33, 35-37 and 46-62, which variously depend from the amended claims, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, claim 34 is amended to cancel "automatically," and thus the rejection is obviated. Thus, claim 34, and claim 35 which depends therefrom, satisfies the

requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 38-41 over Templeman

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3 and 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,845,303 to Templeman (Templeman). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Templeman does not teach or suggest every feature of claims 1, 3 and 38-41. In particular, Templeman does not disclose a layout system "wherein the layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups, moves the information storage frames belonging to one of the plurality of groups so as to have an original relative positional relationship," as recited in independent claims 1 and 3 (emphasis added). Further, Templeman does not disclose a layout program that includes "forming the information storage frames into a plurality of groups; and setting to move the information storage frames, which belong to the same group, so as to have a positional relationship with each other, each of the information storage frames holding its shape when being moved," as recited in claim 38, and as similarly recited in claims 39-41 (emphasis added). Templeman does not disclose a plurality of frame groups. Templeman merely discloses a display area that contains only one metaform, because the metaform defines the relationship between each of the frames that are displayed in "the overall display area" (Templeman, col. 8, lines 24-27 and 36-38). Accordingly, the metaform disclosed in Templeman does not correspond to frame groups that are recited in the independent claims.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 3 and 38-41 are patentable over Templeman. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. §102(b) Rejection of Claim 28-30 over Sams Publishing

The Office Action rejects claims 28-30 over 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over "Sams Teach Yourself Microsoft Publishing 2000 in 10 Minutes," to Sams Publishing. (Sams Publishing). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sams Publishing does not teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 28-30. Sams Publishing does not teach or suggest "wherein the layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups, arranges the information storage frames, which belong to the same group, laterally on the layout region, and sets to move some or all of the information storage frames vertically so as to align upper ends or lower ends, so that the layout is generated," as recited in independent claim 28, and as similarly recited in independent claims 29 and 30 (emphasis added). Sams Publishing merely discloses a layout with a plurality of frames, from which a user can manually select to form a single frame group (Sams Publishing, pg. 25).

Furthermore, Sams Publishing does not disclose a layout section that "arranges the information storage frames which belong to the same group," as recited in independent claim 28, and as similarly recited in independent claims 29 and 30. Sams Publishing merely discloses an Arrange and Group Objects option that a user can select to group objects together on a page (Sams Publishing, pg. 25). A user's direction is necessary for arranging frames. Accordingly, Sam Publishing does not teach or suggest a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a group, arranges the information storage frames, which belong to the same group," as recited in amended independent claims 28-30.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claims 28-30 are patentable over Sams Publishing. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 27, 33-37, 56 and 62 over Templeman

The Office Action rejects claims 27, 33-37, 56, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Templeman. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Templeman does not teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 27, 33-37, 56 and 62. Templeman does not teach or suggest a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups," as recited in independent claim 27, and as similarly recited in independent claim 34 (emphasis added). Templeman merely discloses a display area that contains only one metaform, because the metaform defines the relationship between each of the frames that are displayed in "the overall display area" (Templeman, col. 8, lines 24-27, 36-38).

For at least the reasons discussed, claims 27 and 34 are patentable over Templeman. Further, claims 33, 36 and 37, which depend from independent claim 27, and claims 35, 56, and 62, which depend from independent claim 34, are patentable over Templeman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 27 and 34, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

D. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 5-20 and 23-26 over Templeman in further view of Simmons

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 4, 5-20 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Templeman in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/003350 to Simmons et al. (Simmons). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Templeman and Simmons, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of claims 5, 12, 20 and 23-26. As discussed above, Templeman does not teach or suggest a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups" as recited in independent claim 5, and as similarly recited in independent claims 12, 20 and 23-26 (emphasis added). Simmons does not remedy the deficiencies discussed above

with respect to Templeman. Simmons is cited by the Office Action for only its alleged teaching of solving overlapping.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 12, 20 and 23-26 are patentable over Templeman and Simmons. Further, claims 2, 4, 6-11 and 13-19 variously depend from independent claims 1, 3, 5 and 12. Thus, claims 2, 4, 6-11 and 13-19 are patentable over Templeman and Simmons for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claims 1, 3, 5 and 12, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

E. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 21-22 and 42-45 over Templeman in view of Simmons and in further view of Sams Publishing

The Office Action rejects claims 21-22 and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Templeman in view of Simmons and in further view of Sams Publishing. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Templeman, Simmons and Sams Publishing, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of claims 21-22 and 42-45. None of the applied references teaches or suggests a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups," as recited in independent claims 5, 12 and 20 (emphasis added). Claims 21-22 and 42-45 variously depend from independent claims 5, 12 and 20. Thus, claims 21-22 and 42-45 are patentable over Templeman, Simmons and Sams Publishing for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 5, 12 and 20, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

F. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 31, 49, 54 and 60 over Sams Publishing in view of Simmons and in further view of Luker

The Office Action rejects claims 31, 49, 54 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sams Publishing in view of Simmons and in further view of "Microsoft Publisher 2000 Complete User Guide" (Luker). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sams Publishing, Simmons and Luker, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of independent claim 31. As discussed above, Sams Publishing and Simmons do not teach or suggest a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups" as recited in independent claim 31 (emphasis added). Further, Luker does not remedy the deficiencies of Sams Publishing and Simmons. Luker is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of text having a vertical arrangement.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 31 is patentable over the applied references. Further, claims 49, 54 and 60 depend from independent claims 31. Thus, claims 49, 54 and 60 are patentable over Templeman, Simmons and Sams Publishing for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

G. §103(a) Rejection of Claim 32 over Sams Publishing

The Office Action rejects claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sams Publishing. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sams Publishing does not teach or suggest a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups" as recited in independent claim 32 (emphasis added). As discussed above, Sams Publishing merely discloses a layout with a plurality of frames and a user can manually select frames to form a frame group (Sams Publishing, pg. 25).

For at least the reason discussed, claims 32 is patentable over Sams Publishing. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**H. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 46, 48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61
 over Sams Publishing in further view of Templeman**

The Office Action rejects claims 46, 48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sams Publishing in further view of Templeman. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sams Publishing and Templeman, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of claims 46, 48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61. As discussed above, neither Templeman nor Sams Publishing teaches or suggests a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups" as recited in independent claim 28, and as similarly recited in independent claims 29-32 and 34. Claims 46, 48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61 variously depend from independent claims 29-32 and 34. Thus, claims 46, 48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61 are patentable over Sams Publishing and Templeman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 29-32 and 34, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-62 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/eks

Attachments:

Replacement Sheet (Fig. 31)
Annotated Fig. 31

Date: October 3, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|

F I G. 3 1

